



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Professor Forrest also subscribes to the conventional view that the two chief social movements of modern times are the rise of democracy and the development of industrialism, to both of which he gives an "economic interpretation." He thus fails to interpret the social movement of today in terms of ideals, since there are none socially dominant except the inadequate and conflicting ideals of the possession of wealth and political liberty. That there is some basis for these views no student of modern society would deny. Still several questions might be raised: Are there not as many ruling ideals in society today as in any period of the past? Are not people more united regarding the ideals of social life than they are regarding the methods of attaining those ideals? Does not the socialistic movement itself, so justly criticised by the author, offer fairly conclusive evidence that the ideal of a perfect human society based upon the family life as a model, first set forth by Christianity, holds the minds of men as never before? Finally, are not the humanitarian movements of today, springing largely again from Christianity, and the scientific movement, especially the development of the social sciences, more profoundly significant for our social life than the movements toward democracy and industrialism?

The book closes with a very valuable Appendix on methods of social interpretation and the relations of history and sociology.

It has been said that the bane of sociologists is taking too large "units of investigation;" and there is doubtless truth in the assertion. But the present work, covering as it does the whole history of modern civilization, affords ground for the belief that the time will soon come, if it has not already arrived, when the largest social movements will submit themselves to a strictly scientific psychological analysis as readily as the smallest.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD.

University of Missouri.

Ancient Society. Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization. By LEWIS E. MORGAN. (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Company, 1907. Pp. viii, 570. \$1.50).

Morgan's theories of early social organization were first elaborated in his *Systems of Consanguinity* in 1871. *Ancient Society*,

first published in 1877, developed these theories and extended them over a wider field. The present edition is an unrevised reprint of the first issue. It serves the useful purpose of raising the question as to the present state of opinion on the issues which Morgan was largely instrumental in bringing to the front. It seems entirely unlikely that the final value of his contributions will be measured by the degree of acceptance of his conclusions, for some of them have already been more or less definitely discarded. Certainly the whole trend of present opinion is away from his theory of original promiscuity. Upon the question of the validity of his interpretation of the classificatory system of relationship scholars are as thoroughly divided now as they were thirty years ago. McLennan's original attack has been repeated upon different grounds by Westermarck and more lately by Atkinson and Lang, while the Australian researches of Spencer and Gillen and of Howitt tend to prove that the terms of relationship among certain Australian groups point back to a system of group marriage, as Morgan contended. Westermarck holds that these terms are mere forms of address adjusted to differences of sex, age and social condition. Morgan himself gathered the materials, from which the foundations at least of his theory were formed, from actual field work among the American Indians, and it is significant that those students of the Australian aborigines whose work has been most nearly first-hand have arrived at conclusions essentially similar. So much of Morgan's work is still in controversy. Upon two of his leading ideas there is not only substantial agreement at present, but they may even be said to have become mere commonplaces of knowledge. No one now thinks of the patriarchal family as the most primitive type; and, chiefly through Morgan's researches, the structural identity of the gentile organization of the American Indians with that of the Greeks and Romans has come to be generally recognized.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

University of Indiana.